

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Claims 1, and 3-20 are pending in the present application, with claims 1, 10, 11, and 18-20 being independent. Claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication on page 16 of the outstanding Office Action that claims 7-8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Newly added claims 19 and 20 are representative of allowed claims 7 and 8, respectively, which include the subject matter of their respective base claims. For at least the reasons detailed below, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims should be considered allowable.

***Interview Summary***

Applicants representative would like to thank the Examiner, Tony Mahmoudi, and the Supervisory Examiner, Dov Popovici, for the personal interview that was conducted on May 13, 2003.

***Specification***

Submitted herewith is a second amendment to the specification, whereby the "Summary of the Invention" of the specification has been amended in order to correct a minor informality. Specifically, Applicants have corrected the amendments made to the specification on December 12, 2002 by accurately underlining the terms "delivering" and "delivery condition" and strike-throughing the terms "downloading" and "download condition," respectively.

Applicants note that by this amendment, the term "delivery" replaces the original term "download." As such, Applicants respectfully submit that no new subject matter is introduced.

***Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 1-6 and 9-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Hiyama et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,269,379) in view of *Vaithilingam et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,411,724). This rejection is respectfully traversed insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims.

Independent claim 1 is directed to an image retrieving and delivering server for downloading image data to various types of user terminals, comprising: a data base for registering an image including a moving picture or a static picture with a feature

descriptor or a plurality of feature descriptors of the image; image retrieving means for retrieving the feature descriptor or the feature descriptors registered in the data base according to a retrieval condition input by one of the various types of users and obtaining a retrieval result satisfying the retrieval condition; and contents additional service means for editing and processing the retrieval result according to a delivery condition obtained from the one of the various types of the user terminals in order to download the retrieval result, wherein each of the user terminals has a processing capability according to the type of user terminal, and wherein the delivery condition specifies the processing capability of each user terminal.

*Hiyama et al.*, as stated in the amendment dated December 11, 2002, is directed to a medical image filing system for enabling registration and retrieval of a plurality of medical images. *Hiyama et al.*, appears to teach a local network, however, there is absolutely no mention that *various/different* types of conference units, e.g., user terminals, are connected to the network. Thus, the server 5 of *Hiyama et al.* merely downloads/transmits uniform image data of the same coding format and resolution to all conference units. In other words, the server 5 of *Hiyama et al.*, does not change the resolution and coding format.

As such, *Hiyama et al.* fails to teach or suggest at least a delivery condition that specifies the processing capability of each user terminal, whereby the retrieval result is edited and processed according to the delivery condition, as recited in the independent claims.

In other words, the present invention changes a resolution and a coding format at the server side. This involves acquisition of the delivery condition by the server transmitted from the user terminal and changes the resolution and coding format etc. on the basis of the delivery condition. The acquisition of the delivery condition enables the server to detect the different processing capabilities of every user terminal.

Additionally, the present invention provides a dictionary retrieval service, which is irrespective of manufacturers and types of user terminals because of a change in the resolution and coding format. This achieves commercial success in that a provider should make a profit from its users over a wide area. Besides, at the user terminal side, the removal of a burden on image data processing accomplishes a small-sized and power-saving user terminal.

Claim 10 is directed to a system, and its feature resides in that the server transmits only the meta-data prior to image data.

Through such a configuration, it prevents transmission of unnecessary image data and attains efficient use of a line.

Dependent claims 3-6, 9, and 12-17 should be considered allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New claims 19 and 20 should be considered allowable because, as stated above, they are representative of allowed claims 7 and 8 in independent form.

### ***Conclusion***

In view of the above amendments and remarks, this application appears to be in condition for allowance and the Examiner is, therefore, requested to reexamine the application and pass the claims to issue.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time for one (1) month(s) to June 25, 2003, for filing a reply to the Office Action dated February 25, 2003.


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Martin R. Geissler (Reg. 51,011) at the


telephone number below, which is located in the Washington, DC area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
Michael R. Cammarata, Reg.#39,491

  
MRC/MBG:tm  
1163-0284P

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

Attachments